

REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Drawings

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner objects to drawings under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) as not including reference sign 4017 in Fig. 12A. Applicants have amended Fig. 12A to add the missing sign. No new matter has been added, and it is requested that this objection now be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-4, 9-12 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Takahara et al. '355. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 9 to recite a second optical element having a surface on which the image is reflected (see e.g. page 7, lns. 5-18 and Fig. 2 of the present application).

Applicants respectfully submit that the optic view finder of Fig. 219 of Takahara '355 (cited by the Examiner in the Final Rejection) does not include a reflector. Accordingly, the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Therefore, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

The Examiner further rejects Claims 5-8 and 13-16 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahara et al. '355 in view of Takahara et al. '278. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended Claims 5 and 13, in a manner similar to that of Claims 1 and 9 discussed above, to recite that at least one of the optical elements has a surface on which the image is reflected.

Applicants do not believe that this feature is disclosed or suggested by either of the cited references. For example, while Takahara '278 discloses a reflector 91 in Figs. 9 and 10, the reflector 91 appears to be provided to reflect a light emitted from a light emitting device 21. Hence, reflector 91 does not reflect an image of an object.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Therefore, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark J. Murphy
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500